

THREE ARMENIAN SOUND LAWS

ERIC P. HAMP

University of Chicago

ARMENIAN *UL* 'KID'

I have proposed (*Glossologia* [Athens] 2-3, 1983-1984, 163-8) on the basis of a canvass of Greek that in absolute final position IE

1. *liquid + laryngeal in zero-grade imparted a preceding *o vocalization in pre-Greek; and then
2. *laryngeal was realized as lengthening of the vowel preceding the liquid.

Then later prehistoric suffixations, which were obligatory in the case of *-λ, concealed the fact that these developments happened regularly in final position.

Of the twelve instances that support my argument a notable case is πῶλος 'foal, filly'. I derive πῶλος as a later thematization from *plH, which is also the base of the derivation which forms the Germanic etymon of English *foal* and the etymon of Albanian *pelë* 'mare' and of Welsh *elein*, pl. *alaned* 'doe, fawn'. The same base gives an Albanian verb *piell* 'give birth'.

It has long been claimed that Armenian *ul* is cognate with

πώλος¹ I have clarified (*Journal of Turkish Studies: An Anniversary Volume in Honor of Francis Woodman Cleaves* 9, 1985, 133-5) the appearance of *h*- and zero in Armenian as the reflexes of IE **p*-; in that study I find the cognacy of *ul* to be perfectly acceptable.

This means that the development of **plH* > **polH* > **pōl* was shared by Greek and Armenian.

ARMENIAN *ARMUKN* 'ELBOW'

I have discussed this word *JIES* 10, 1982, 188-9, where I concluded (188) "that Arm. *armukn* is a derivative of the *anīt* base seen in Greek ἄρμός, ἄραισκω, Arm. *ařnem*, etc." R.S.P. Beekes has reconstructed (*Die Laryngaltheorie*, ed. A. Bammesberger, Heidelberg: Winter 1988, 78) **ArHmo-muHsm*. I have pointed out (loc. cit.) that the sequence cannot be **ArH-*. Yet I think now Beekes's form with a first member suffixed in *-*mo-* a good hypothesis, especially because it is semantically and radically invariant from the IE point of view.

However, a *-*mō-* formation in any case would call for an *O-grade*². Therefore I propose **A or Hmo-muHsm* → **AerHmo-muHsm* (cf. *đerm*, *KZ* 96, 171 ff.) > **aramomuH(s)m* > **aramumuHn* > **arumukn* (syllabic haplology) > *armukn* (regular syncope). Because the **A* here fails to appear as Arm. *h-* it must have been IE **h* = *h*⁴; this did not colour an adjacent **o*, and therefore the **e* vocalism is to be assumed³.

Correcting *JIES* 10, we now see that we have reflexes of IE

1. Meillet, *Esquisse* 48, attaches to this *am-ul* 'sterile', with the important *-m-*; and *yti* 'pregnant', which must be a later derivative, one based on **ōl-*.

2. E.P. Hamp, *KZ* 96, 1982-83, 171-7. Note also the remarks on zero-grade and 'arm' at 175.

3. The **e* vocalism here and in Lat. *armus* seems cheaper than the irregular loss of Arm. *h-*.

'arm' in Indo-Iranian, Armenian, Balto-Slavic, Germanic, and Latin.

IE *RHC IN ARMENIAN

Beekes correctly credits (*Die Laryngaltheorie*, ed. A. Bammesberger, Heidelberg: Winter 1988, 78) *ana* and *ata* in *canac'em* 'know' and *atac'em* 'ask' to *ǵnO-sk- and *slA-sk-; I would write *ǵnAʷ-sk- and *slA-sk-. See my formulation, *Études in memoriam Haig Berbérian*, ed. D. Kouymjian, Lisbon: Gulbenkian, 1986, 293, and *AALing*. 6, 1985, 52; the corresponding outcome for *r is *ařa*.

Beekes is undecided whether *CaRawC* is another development; I think the answer is in the affirmative. *canawi* 'known' must be < *ǵnAʷ-t-, and *atawi* 'prayer' < *slA-ti-. Whether *nawt'i* 'sober, jejune' is *n'dti(o)- is a little less clear in detail although this must be put in equivalence with νῆστις, and thus reflect *n'-t-ti-. In all of these the laryngeal appears to have left behind the w segment before the (perhaps ultima) stop, in these cases dental.

It seems that we may find within Armenian a plausible phonetic motivation for this outcome. Recall that *septm yields *ewt'n*. Recall too that *p yields besides w (no doubt via *ɸ), both h and zero (via *ɸ next to rounded vowel); cf. my study, *Journal of Turkish Studies* 9, 1985, 133-5. At one stage, then, *p had the value [ɸ ~ h]. We need only assume that at that time the *h which had (e)merged from the laryngeal non-syllabics was overtaken by the successors to *p, and developed contextually to w. At the same time the *t was protected by the spirant.